DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 803 JC 780 082

AUTHOR Bochniarz, Robert H.
TITLE Faculty Motivation for a Separate Board of Education and Superintendent at Glendale Community College.
PUB DATE 29 Jun 77
NOTE 43p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *Chief Administrators; College Administration; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Elementary Secondary Education; Governance; *Governing Boards; *Junior Colleges; Questionnaires; *School Districts; School Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted among 140 Glendale Community College (California) full-time and part-time faculty to determine their attitudes and motivations regarding the formation of a separate board of education and/or a separate superintendent-president from that of the Glendale Unified School District. The respondents (53%) indicated they were in favor of a new college governance model and structure that would separate the college from the K-12 governance structure. They felt it would facilitate more direct and responsive local decision-making, improved faculty and staff morale, greater administrative and decision-making efficiency, faculty and institutional status, and greater responsiveness to the higher education needs of the community. Faculty generally responded that they would give greater support to the governance structure by attending board meetings and reading board reports, should a separate board be formed. Tabulated data are included and the questionnaire is appended. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FACULTY MOTIVATION FOR A SEPARATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND SUPERINTENDENT AT GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ED149803

Robert M. Bochniarz, M.S.
Glendale Community College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert M. Bochniarz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

June 29, 1977

JC 700 082

ABSTRACT

FACULTY MOTIVATION FOR A
SEPARATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND SUPERINTENDENT AT
GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Robert M. Bochniarz

Of the 70 community college districts in existence in California, all have completely separate administrations and Boards except Glendale, Long Beach and Santa Monica. Forty-seven districts with a single campus all have one Superintendent-President reporting to their college Board of Trustees -- with the exception of the three, above-mentioned districts. Several attempts have been made over the last ten plus years to make Glendale Community College more autonomous through "separation." As each has failed, the faculty has re-evaluated the issue and dealt with its concern through various channels, chief of which has been the Faculty Senate. This study was conducted to determine the current attitudes and motivations of the Glendale Community College faculty over the issue of separation.

A survey of the entire 140 day faculty, part-time and full-time, was conducted. Respondents were asked to give their opinion on 12 major issues, listed in positive and negative form, as well as to write in their reasons for wanting or not wanting a separate Board and/or a separate Superintendent-President in a thirteenth survey item.

The findings indicated that the Glendale Community College day faculty heavily favor both a separate Board of Trustees and a separate

Superintendent-President. Further indicated was a strong consistency of responses to different sides of the issue. Recommendations developed from the study included 1.) A vote on the separation issue be conducted by the Board at the Faculty Senate's request. 2.) The formation of a special "association" committee be undertaken by the college President. 3.) If necessary, continued work by the faculty through professional representatives at the union as well as at the State level to expedite legislation mandating separation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	TITLE	1
II.	INTRODUCTION	1
III.	BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	3
IV.	PROCEDURES	9
V.	RESULTS	12
VI.	DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	22
VII.	APPENDICES	30
VIII.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	37

I. TITLE

Faculty motivations for a separate Board of Education and Superintendent Glendale Community College.

II. INTRODUCTION

Of the 70 community college districts in the State of California, all but three have moved to a separate Board of Trustees and a separate Superintendent-President. Glendale, Santa Monica and Long Beach stand alone for having retained a governance structure in common with the K-12. Each of these three college districts has coterminous boundaries with a unified school district and thus serves essentially the same population under a common Board. However, both Santa Monica and Long Beach have taken steps to form their own Superintendent-President, leaving Glendale as the last to consider a change in its major governance structure.

On July 1, 1970, Glendale Community College was established as a district legally and fiscally separate from the Glendale Unified District. But even before that time, as early as 1967, the Glendale College faculty had been actively involved in expressing their concern for a separate college district organization.

This investigation was undertaken to examine the concerns of the present faculty relative to their motivations for a separate

Board of Education and a separate Superintendent-President. Though principal attention has been given to the faculty as they speak out on and enter into the governance process, appropriate consideration has also been given to the other major actors. Resources and references used include contributions from students, trustees, faculty leaders and union representatives in an attempt to present a clear picture of "separation" as this issue relates to all actors within the governance framework.

Literature read and reviewed ranged from faculty and independent studies and reports, which were many, to some books and a couple of newspapers. (See "Bibliography") For purposes of this study, a principal source was of course the Glendale Community College Faculty. First the major issues surrounding "separation" were gleaned from personal interviews with respected faculty leaders. From these informal rap sessions, a first questionnaire was developed and then distributed to several, randomly chosen faculty. Results from the pre-test indicated the questionnaire needed redesigning to eliminate bias. (See Appendix A.) The original thirteen questions were subsequently arranged in an alternating, positive/negative fashion, so that respondents were given a clearer perspective over 26 questions. A cover letter was developed, and the entire 140, full-time and part-time day faculty were subsequently surveyed. (See Appendix B and C.) Slightly over 53% (75) responded.

Much has been said and reported for some several years regarding separation of the college from the K-12. But there

was a current need to bring the faculty's concerns on this important and timely issue back into focus. Through this study the following principal aims were included: 1.) To identify faculty rationale for a separate Board, a separate Superintendent-President. 2.) To uncover steps toward possible improved college governance. 3.) To present some suggestions for dealing with governance problems that surround the separation issue.

III. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

At the core of the whole issue of separation is the question of, what is a community college? When Glendale College was founded in April of 1927, it was regarded as an extension of the high school and thus the K-14 model of governance with one Board and one Superintendent appropriately prevailed. But by 1960 the California State Legislature placed all of the then "junior" colleges into the framework of the Master Plan for Higher Education. Part of the rationale for the State's Master Plan was due to a major threat to the public community/junior college of being transformed into a State college. (7, p. 20) Additionally, the precise role of the community college was changing. Hence the State Board of Education took the first step at defining the two-year college as a unique institution, no longer a post-high school and never to become a State college or university.

Taking its cue perhaps from the spirit of the new Master Plan, the accreditation team of 1961 and the subsequent one of 1966

recommended a close look at the merits of separating Glendale College from the K-12. The faculty of the then "Glendale Junior" or "Glendale City" College picked up on those recommendations, such that by February of 1968 a first-published, faculty study, "The Melbo Report," advanced the proposition that "we may never realize our greatest potential as a public community college until we are separated from the unified district structure and established with our own Board of Trustees." (5, p. 2) The 103 out of 104 faculty members who voted on May 4, 1967, in favor of support for separation cited chiefly these reasons: "a serious morale problem," "competition for the best new faculty," "more creative teaching," "collegiate prestige," "establishing the college's own identity in the community" as well as "to be more aware of and to meet community needs." At the "conclusion" of the Melbo Report, the faculty indicated their concern to have a separate Board "with whom the college staff could interact frequently and directly."

Joining the college faculty in their study of the separation issue, the League of Women Voters of Glendale reported their findings in March of 1968. The results from that study, which included interviews with numerous administrators within the school district, questionnaires from seniors of all three, local high schools, local college students and others, produced over 1,000 returns and indicated the following: 1.) Separation of the college from the school district is desirable to enhance the collegial image of the institution. 2.) The community

should be encouraged to consider separation now. 3.) The Board of Education should assume leadership on this issue. (12) Further arguments advanced in that study centered around the lack of time that goes with one Board for both the unified and the college.

Then, in 1969, a new State Board for Community Colleges, the Board of Governors, was set up and a community college Chancellor was appointed by the Governor. That major change in governance at the State level became the impetus for the subsequent separation of all California community colleges from the high school districts.

On July 1, 1970, Glendale College thus became legally and fiscally separated as a district from the unified district. Later, in 1971, the accreditation team which visited the college in October zeroed in on the implications of the July, 1970, State act and made the following strong recommendation relative to separation.

> "The team recommends that the administration of Glendale College, with total assistance of staff, continue to exercise strong, vigorous leadership toward the end that Glendale Community College District may become a district separate and independent, in fact, from that of Glendale Unified School District. It is further necessary that the District Superintendent and Board work closely with the college to initiate action which will establish a separate Board of Trustees." (2, p. 31)

Not long after the 1971 Accreditation Report was completed, the Superintendent and the Board of Education commissioned an outside consulting firm to undertake a study on the "major cost and administrative implications of separating Glendale College from the Glendale Unified School District." (3, "Forward")

The Board was then aware of its lawful right to fully separate the two systems either by its own action or by the affirmative vote of the electorate of the community. "Cost," which amounted to approximately $100,000, as the study revealed, was the major reason cited by the Board for not exercising its prerogative under Bill 1575 to vote for separation. Some of the other non-fiscal implications concerning separation were not commissioned to the American Educational Services study; however, the consultants did feel an obligation to present observations on certain issues beyond the scope of the study. They, therefore, included under the "Perspective" section of that study the statement that "a majority of faculty favors total separation and (that) a decision to not separate may create serious morale problems at the college." (3, II-3, 1972)

As keeper of the "trust" and the taxpayers' money, the Board responded to the April, 1972, study by placing the issue on the next ballot and letting the community decide. In the interim, the Faculty Senate president made two presentations before the Board, attempting to persuade them to decide themselves in favor of a separate college Board. Guilmette (10) referred to the separate Board as "a logical extension of present practice," "a way to relieve the present K-14 Board of a substantial portion of an already excessive work load." He further declared that "faculty's morale and pride would be greatly enhanced by the knowledge that the president's position had been strengthened and made more meaningful." "The result

would be both better and more varied instruction," Guilmette went on to say. But at the outset the matter went to the community, to the taxpayers, who voted down separation on the November, 1972, ballot -- by less than one-half percent.

The decision by the small but nevertheless majority portion of taxpayers told the faculty that the community, in essence, felt a continued bureaucratic governance model, structured "K-14", was what the local citizens wanted. Clearly, the faculty had worked toward and preached for a less bureaucratic, more shared governance model. A multitude of students had joined in helping walk the precincts to assist the faculty with their concern for the passage of Proposition DD. Almost ironically, it was the combined efforts of the entire college community which helped realize the passage of the tax override issue at that same time. ("BB" passed, "DD" failed.) But, as Richardson and Bender (15, p. 17) point out, "Each (educational) institution is a different organization operating within its own separate environment." And the governance process that culminated in the taxpayers' decision of 1972 made it essential that Glendale College retain its governance structure. Thwarted in their efforts to re-define the administrative organization of the institution, the faculty had failed to achieve separation.

For nearly two years, until late 1974, the faculty resigned itself to the mandate of the Glendale voters. The leaders of

the 1972 "separation movement" seemed exhausted or at least at a loss for a next move. But new leaders appeared, addressing themselves to the issue through the 1974 Faculty Senate. A committee on "Complete Separation of the Board of Education" was constituted. Supported by the Associated Student Body (See letter, Appendix D.), the Senate pursued the re-opening of the study on separation. On November 1, 1976, a letter, addressed to the Board of Education, let it be known that the Senate had renewed its concern. Before the Board had responded, the Accreditation Evaluation Team for November 16-18, 1976, had come and gone. Their written findings, reported on January 26, 1977, pointed out that "Separation of the college from the Glendale Unified School District is the primary concern of the faculty." And that "it (separation) may be in the long-range best interest of the college." (1, "summary" page) Soon to follow was a positive move by the Board: on February 2, 1977, the Superintendent sent the reply to the Senate (signed by the Board) that Arthur D. Little, Inc., an independent consulting firm, had been commissioned to undertake a "cost feasibility" study (due to be completed July, 1977).

Further scope was added recently to this "separation" problem in governance by the Associated Students. Their Separation Study Committee reported at the May 10, 1977, Board meeting that "The first step toward separation should be the establishment of a separate college Superintendent." (4, p. 5) Under "Faculty," the Associated Students study indicated that the tone

of the faculty concerns for separation stem chiefly from "their concern about the quality of education at the college." (4, p. 2) But that particular study appeared preoccupied with what was summarized under "Administration," when it stated "The administration, however, suggested that there are alternatives to the matter, such as a separate Superintendent." (4, p. 3) And, perhaps, that is why the principal conclusion of that study was limited to recommending a separate Superintendent-President.

This study has focused chiefly on the day faculty of Glendale Community College. Their present concerns surrounding the various issues that constitute the separation problem have been heard and surveyed. And within this study, results have been reported and summarized so that implications and recommendations may be clearly drawn from those findings.

IV. PROCEDURES

A. The problem was stated.

B. The background and significance was discussed as this issue relates to the module, Governance.

C. A survey of the literature related to the whole issue of separation was undertaken, including books, mimeographed materials, newspapers and periodicals.

D. Interviews were conducted with several faculty members from various departments in order to facilitate content for a questionnaire as well as to uncover other issues on the subject.

E. A questionnaire was developed, incorporating the salient and most frequently stated reasons faculty gave for/against separation during interviews by the researcher.

F. The first questionnaire was distributed to a representative sample of the day faculty. It contained thirteen questions surrounding reasons for/against separation. Upon reviewing the responses, the researcher noted a more objective format was needed. Hence, a second questionnaire, utilizing an alternating positive then negative statement, was designed. (See Appendix B.) In addition to twenty-four alternating, positive/negative statements, the questionnaire contained two write-in questions, concerning the main issues itself. Two brief questions relating to demographic information concluded the questionnaire.

Internal validation of the questionnaire was verified by comparing responses to the positive and negative forms of a few randomly selected statements. Little variation was noted over the four issues selected, which correlated identically or very closely on all but 2 and 14, "Communication." (In fact,

four of the eight respondents modified their positions on the issue, three slightly -- that is, from "neutral" on the negative to "agree" on the positive -- and one significantly.)

G. A cover letter was designed to introduce the final questionnaire from an unbiased position. (See Appendix A.) Both the cover letter and the questionnaire were then distributed to all 140 day faculty on May 11, 1977.

H. Personal interviews were conducted with representatives of the two, local union organizations in an attempt to ascertain if any enabling legislation might be forthcoming. The local president of the California Teachers Association, as well as that of the local California Federation of Teachers, were consulted.

It was expected that this study would accomplish the following objectives:

1. Identify whether or not the faculty favors a separate Board of Trustees.
2. Identify whether or not the faculty favors a separate Superintendent/President.
3. Determine in what ways the faculty perceives that a separate Board and perhaps a separate Superintendent/President might improve the campus climate, the curriculum, the communication and the decision-making processes.

4. Determine whether or not the faculty views "separation" as the most important, current local issue.

5. Ascertain if any enabling State legislation on the issue of "separation" might be forthcoming.

V. RESULTS

The opinion poll or questionnaire, distributed to each of the 140 day faculty, resulted in completed returns from 75 or a bit more than 53% of the population surveyed. A total of three (3) of those items surveyed were left with either no response (2) or a write-in (1). (The two blanks or non-responses occurred under "Demographic Information.") Responses from part-time day faculty were deliberately given the same consideration as those of the full-time, and their responses were included in the internal validation of the questionnaire, described under "Procedures."

Faculty responses varied, though on many of the questions surveyed very close or nearly identical inverted relationships were obtained. (Note especially Tables IV, VI and VIII through X.) In each Table, the order of responses given to the second issue statement have been reversed for clarity and ease of reading. And the introduction to each Table presupposes as in the questionnaire itself an understanding that the respondent has read the question which introduces the questionnaire, "To what extent do you believe the following would occur if Glendale College elected to have a separate Board of Education?".

TABLE I

"THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS WOULD/WOULD NOT BE IMPROVED"

(Questions 1 and 13, respectively)

Level		Would		Would Not
1	Strongly Agree	29	Strongly Disagree	37
2	Agree	30	Disagree	28
3	Neutral	11	Neutral	5
4	Disagree	2	Agree	2
5	Strongly Disagree	2	Strongly Agree	2
		(N = 74)		(N = 74)

One respondent wrote "I don't think this can be predicted." in responding to the above. Responses at the "Strongly Agree" level on "would" ran 39% (29) while from the negative or "would not" correlary under "Strongly Disagree" exactly 50% (37). However, significant variation occured under "Neutral". At levels 2, 4 and 5, greater similarity was found.

TABLE II

"COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE FACULTY AND THE ADMINISTRATION WOULD NOT/WOULD BE IMPROVED"

(Question 2 and 14, respectively)

Level		Would Not		Would
1	Strongly Agree	41	Strongly Disagree	36
2	Agree	24	Disagree	30
3	Neutral	6	Neutral	5
4	Disagree	2	Agree	2
5	Strongly Disagree	2	Strongly Agree	2
		(N = 75)		(N = 75)

From the top two levels of response under "would not" and "would", the faculty have a total of 86% (65) and 89% (66), respectively. Respondents were in nearly exact agreement on each issue surveyed under "would" and "would not" over the last three questions in Table II.

TABLE III

"THE NEW BOARD WOULD/WOULD NOT RECEIVE SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER SUPPORT FROM THE FACULTY IN THE FORM OF ATTENDANCE AT BOARD MEETINGS, READING BOARD REPORTS, ETC."

(Questions 3 and 15, respectively)

Level	Would		Would Not	
1	Strongly Agree	42	Strongly Disagree	35
2	Agree	26	Disagree	28
3	Neutral	4	Neutral	6
4	Disagree	2	Agree	5
5	Strongly Disagree	1	Strongly Agree	1
		(N = 75)		(N = 75)

Responses at the two upper levels ran 88% (68) and 84% (63), respectively, under "would" and "would not." The greatest differences were found at levels 1 and 4.

TABLE IV

"THE NEW BOARD WOULD NOT/WOULD BE MORE RESPONSIVE TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY"

(Questions 4 and 16, respectively)

Level		Would Not		Would
1	Strongly Agree	40	Strongly Disagree	41
2	Agree	22	Disagree	22
3	Neutral	6	Neutral	7
4	Disagree	5	Agree	3
5	Strongly Disagree	2	Strongly Agree	1
		(N = 75)		(N = 75)

Responses at each level were nearly identical, reflecting 83-84% of the faculty responding at the two upper levels to questions 4 and 16.

TABLE V

"THE NEW BOARD WOULD/WOULD NOT PROVIDE GREATER ADMINISTRATIVE AND DECISION-MAKING EFFICIENCY"

Questions 5 and 17, respectively)

Level		Would		Would Not
1	Strongly Agree	58	Strongly Disagree	39
2	Agree	13	Disagree	31
3	Neutral	3	Neutral	3
4	Disagree	0	Agree	1
5	Strongly Disagree	1	Strongly Agree	1
		(N = 75)		(N = 75)

Responses varied considerably at level 1 with 77% (58) responding "Strongly Agree" on the positive statement of the issue and 52% (39) responding "Strongly Disagree" on the negative statement. However, the combined totals for levels 1 and 2 were nearly the same on both the positive and negative statements.

TABLE VI

"THE STATUS OF THE FACULTY AND INSTITUTION WOULD NOT/WOULD BE ENHANCED"

(Questions 6 and 18, respectively)

Level	Would Not		Would	
1	Strongly Agree	47	Strongly Disagree	47
2	Agree	18	Disagree	18
3	Neutral	6	Neutral	7
4	Disagree	2	Agree	1
5	Strongly Disagree	2	Strongly Agree	2
		(N = 75)		(N = 75)

Slightly over 62% (47) of the faculty responded at level 1 for both "would not" and "would". Notably, level 2 was identical under each heading, giving nearly 87% (65) of the responses to the top two levels. A one-vote variation was recorded at levels 3 and 4.

TABLE VII

"THE MORALE OF THE FACULTY AND STAFF
WOULD/WOULD NOT BE IMPROVED"

(Questions 7 and 19, respectively)

Level		Would		Would Not
1	Strongly Agree	59	Strongly Disagree	39
2	Agree	12	Disagree	30
3	Neutral	3	Neutral	3
4	Disagree	0	Agree	1
5	Strongly Disagree	1	Strongly Agree	2
		(N = 75)		(N = 75)

A variance of some 26% at level 1 occurred in responses to this question, as with question 5 (Table V). However, when adding levels 1 and 2 together, the numbers ran much closer, each of the top two representing over 92% of those responding.

TABLE VIII

"THE NEW BOARD WOULD NOT/WOULD DEAL ANY BETTER
WITH THE LAWS AND EDUCATIONAL CODES
AS THEY RELATE DIRECTLY TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE"

(Questions 8 and 20, respectively)

Level		Would Not		Would
1	Strongly Agree	40	Strongly Disagree	40
2	Agree	28	Disagree	28
3	Neutral	4	Neutral	3
4	Disagree	2	Agree	2
5	Strongly Disagree	1	Strongly Agree	1
		(N = 75)		(N = 75)

53% (40) of the respondents indicated level 1 on both "would" and "would not". The number was identical in each column for levels 2, 4 and 5, as well. 91% (68) responded in the upper two levels of this issue.

TABLE IX

"GLENDALE TAXPAYERS WOULD/WOULD NOT RECEIVE GREATER VALUE FOR THEIR TAX INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION"

(Questions 9 and 21, respectively)

Level		Would		Would Not
1	Strongly Agree	29	Strongly Disagree	27
2	Agree	28	Disagree	28
3	Neutral	14	Neutral	16
4	Disagree	2	Agree	2
5	Strongly Disagree	2	Strongly Agree	2
		(N = 75)		(N = 75)

Responses at level 1 equaled 38% (29) for "would" and 36% (27) for "would not". Taken to level 2, the total figure represented some 75% of those responding. However, the "neutral" position was more pronounced here than on any previous question, amounting to 18% (14) and 21% (16) respectively.

TABLE X

"THE FACULTY WOULD NOT/WOULD BE MORE MOTIVATED TO INNOVATE AND INITIATE IMPROVEMENTS IN COLLEGE PROGRAMS"

(Questions 10 and 22, respectively)

Level		Would Not		Would
1	Strongly Agree	28	Strongly Disagree	29
2	Agree	30	Disagree	25
3	Neutral	11	Neutral	14
4	Disagree	4	Agree	5
5	Strongly Disagree	2	Strongly Agree	2
		(N = 75)		(N = 75)

Responses at level 1 represented 37% (28) of the faculty under "would not" and 38% (29) under "would" on this same issue. Taken to the second level, responses then became 77% (58) under "would not" and 72% (54) under "would". As in the issue surveyed in Table IX, the "nuetral" level had a higher index of response than any of the other Tables.

TABLE XI

"THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE FACING GLENDALE COLLEGE AT THIS TIME IS/IS NOT WHETHER OR NOT IT SHOULD HAVE A SEPARATE BOARD OF EDUCATION"

(Questions 11 and 23, respectively)

Level		Is		Is Not
1	Strongly Agree	30	Strongly Disagree	30
2	Agree	29	Disagree	27
3	Neutral	6	Neutral	7
4	Disagree	8	Agree	8
5	Strongly Disagree	2	Strongly Agree	3
		(N = 75)		(N = 75)

40% (30) responded at level 1 to both "is" and "is not" on this issue. Taken to the second level, 77% (59) compared with 76% (57) as the total on the corresponding sides of the issue.

TABLE XII

"EVEN IF THE COST IS NOT SIGNIFICANT, GLENDALE COLLEGE SHOULD/SHOULD NOT HAVE A SEPARATE BOARD OF EDUCATION"

(Questions 12 and 24, respectively)

Level	Should		Should Not	
1	Strongly Agree	50	Strongly Disagree	52
2	Agree	21	Disagree	19
3	Neutral	2	Neutral	1
4	Disagree	2	Agree	3
5	Strongly Disagree	0	Strongly Agree	0
		(N = 75)		(N = 75)

Those responding at levels 1 and 2 on each corresponding side indicated a bit more than 94% (71) support for a separate Board on the issue of "cost," "if the cost is not significant."

Responses to the write-in questions, 25 and 26, on the questionnaire produced some new and some repeated faculty concerns. To question 25, which read "Why should or why shouldn't Glendale College have a separate Board of Education," responses "why it should" included the following:

"More time for the Board to work on college needs." (13)

"More positive faculty morale." (7)

"Less red tape, greater efficiency." (7)

"Upgrade institution to community college status." (5)

"Greater autonomy." (4)

"Improved service to the community." (4)

"Because all other community colleges have them." (2)

"More direct, responsive decision-making." (2)

Responses on the negative side — i.e., "Why Glendale College shouldn't have a separate Board," were limited to three.

"The same kinds of people on the present Board would be on the new one." (1)

"The district would lose money due to the duplication that would occur." (1)

"The loss of Taylor (Dr. Taylor, the Superintendent/President) would result in no one to take his place." (1)

Arguments for/against a separate Superintendent/President included the following:

<u>For:</u>

"Improved accountability"

"Better service to the community"

"Knowledge of college programs and personnel greatly improved"

"Reduced restraints"

"Superintendent should be directly responsible to the Board and the college staff. His time should not be divided"

"Total autonomy is needed"

"The advantages of having a separate Board are nullified by retaining a common Superintendent"

Against:

"Not enough work for two" (Superintendents that is) This person also wrote in that he or she would go for a separate Superintendent/President if that would be a person other than the present President.

VI. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Spanning more than a decade of controversy, the Glendale Community College "separation" issue has been dealt with and acted upon by each of the major actors within the governance system. The Taxpayer, the Board, The Superintendent, the College Administration, the Faculty and the Associated Students have each had some role in stating their position on separation. As related to the dominant college governance model, each position stands in some way unique; yet two distinctive views emerge: The Administration, as a whole, has sided with the small majority of 1972 taxpayers who voted to retain a bureaucratic model; whereas the day faculty, almost universally, have opted for a participatory governance model. Positioned somewhere at middle-ground, the Associated Students have taken a more compromising or balanced position. (A recent study by an Associated Student Committee on Separation included a recommendation to the Board for a separate Superintendent/ President, but joint Board for the college. However, that study may have been more than slightly biased due to the fact

that 7 of the 9 respondents were administrators.) (See 4. "Sources", pp. 1-2) Nevertheless, whatever the point of view, all of the sources and kinds of input indicate there has been a need, particularly one felt by the faculty, to influence the decision-making process of the college.

More than one explanation might be advanced as to why the faculty -- and a few significant others -- persist in their quest for a new college governance model and structure. For one, as Baldridge clearly stated, "Access to decision councils for all groups -- faculty, students and administrators is an absolute minimum." (6, p. 207) Many of the faculty in responding to this study's survey indicated their concern for "more direct/responsive local decision-making." (Their implicit message was that decisions are often made elsewhere, "downtown" as a couple of respondents put it.) A reference to the "red tape" involved in influencing the decision process was additionally written in by some 7 survey respondents. In fact, the two issues receiving the greatest amount of votes at the "strongly agree" and "agree" levels combined were numbers 7, dealing with "improved morale of the faculty and staff," and 2, "The new Board would provide greater administrative and decision-making efficiency." (See "Results", Tables V and VII.) Faculty appear considerably frustrated by the college's lack of autonomy insofar as most decisions are concerned. As last year's Accreditation Team reported, "Administrative organization of Glendale Community College is apparently the result of decisions far separated in space and time." The

majority of the faculty want to localize that process completely.

Further reasons the faculty indicated for wanting a new governance model and structure were closely related to the status and the welfare of the institution. Questions numbered 6/18 and 4/16, concerning enhancing the "status of the faculty and the institution" and being "more responsive to the higher education needs of the community," appeared in mutual support of still a second reason for a new model/structure of governance. Once decisions have been made, according to the majority responses to the faculty questionnaire, those decisions have tended to not enhance the campus as being a unique institution of Higher Education and, too, have often not been fully responsive to the higher education needs of the community. Therefore, the faculty appear to be challenging a governance structure and model which they feel has failed in that regard. As the Carnegie Commission put it, "The basic test of governance is whether or not the decisions actually made do or do not enhance the long-run welfare of higher education and of society, and the unique quality of the individual campus." (8, p. 79) Houtz (11) pointed out how the concept of the "Junior" (Community) College has changed since the days of the K-14 structure and how a change in governance is essential to the continued growth of the institution. The Glendale Community College day faculty seem to concur with those authorities in seeking a change in governance aimed at

improving the general welfare. In support of their governance preference, faculty responses to questions numbered 4 and 6 received nearly identical responses to those of their negatives on these issues -- numbers 16 and 18, respectively. Their preference on this appeared extremely consistent.

Faculty at the college would, they largely responded, give "significantly greater support in the form of attendance at Board meetings, reading Board reports, etc. "if the college had a separate Board. Wanting more of the interaction and communication reported by Richardson, the faculty appear eager to have that kind of relationship with their own, local Board: "The nature of our community colleges are such that our Trustees are in constant contact with students and faculty." (17, p. 7) Both at Board meetings and outside of them, interaction and communication between the Board and faculty of Glendale Community College needs considerable improvement.

Yet, any significant change -- such as that proposed by a separate Board and a separate Superintendent/President -- would require role changes. The basic model would have to become "more nearly a circle with spheres of influence and less like the traditional pyramid." (16, p. 21) Underlying the problem of moving the Board to a new governance role, however, is another reality noted by Richardson -- that is, "Upon careful examination, we find that administrators and trustees who consitute by and large the most conservative elements of

the college community have resisted change in the role dimensions of the institution to the best of their ability. (16, p. 21) No doubt, this Board personality syndrome is but one of the reasons the State of California, acting as intervenor, has entered the scene by mandating collective bargaining. Under the Bill (SB 160), the roles and relationships within the community college have been formally re-defined as of July 1, 1976. (See 13)

Within the next few months, the relationship and roles of the Glendale Community College faculty and the administration will be largely determined by the union representation the faculty may vote for in the forthcoming election. With the entrance of still another actor into the governance arena, the college community can count on the growing influence of a political model of governance. The faculty seem to not only be aware of the implications of collective bargaining, but they also appear to see this new law as a further reason for a separate Board and Superintendent/President. "The new Board could better deal with the laws and educational codes as they relate directly to the community college." (Question 20, received 68 of the 75 votes at the "strongly agree" and "agree" levels, which was identical to the number responding to the negative form, question 8.) Further, as 9 respondents wrote in on question 25, "The Board needs more time in order to be better informed." When the 1971 Accreditation study took place, October 26-28, only 2 of the 5 Board members were present for the review and oral report, and the Superintendent was out of

town. (2, p. 34) More recently at the May 10, 1977, Board meeting, Board members appeared generally uninformed on the subject of a major, proposed program. Once certain information was made known to them, however, by the Faculty Senate President, this researcher and three concerned former students, Board members became quite responsive to that need -- the proposed R.N. program. It was quite clear that before that evening, they either had not the time or the source for other, earlier input on the subject.

To facilitate communication between faculty and Board, and perhaps create the climate necessary for change, several steps may be taken by the faculty and the administration. For one, the Faculty Senate might extend an open, formal invitation to have a Board member meet on a regular basis as an "ex officio" Senate visitor. Secondly, in order to bring students and community into focus, a special "Glendale Community College Association" might be formed. This Committee would meet with Board members and faculty three or four times a year in an advisory capacity. The College President would see to the format. But members of the "Association" would be representative of all age groups. (Perhaps the President of the college, the Faculty Senate President and the Associated Student Body President would each help in the recruitment of "Associates".)

The responsibilities of the Board members and Superintendent are great. Most of the college faculty are aware of this fact,

and expressed it in a number of ways in this study's survey. However, nowhere in the survey responses was a recommendation made that the Board be helped in evaluating themselves. At least one instrument has been developed for use in this area -- "Performance Expectations for Responsible Community College Trustees" "Enhancing Trustee Effectiveness." (9, p. 28) And if each present Board member were to participate in such an evaluation, then perhaps even a separate Superintendent/President may be in order for the college.

In August of this year, Assembly Bill 1827 will be heard in the California State Senate. That Bill passed the Assembly with "absolutely no opposition." (18) If passed, it will allow the Long Beach Unified School District (K-14) Board, on its own initiative, to determine that a separate Community College Board be established. Santa Monica has made preparation to advance similar steps. Like Long Beach, Santa Monica has a separate Superintendent/President with plans for a separate Board. Glendale Community College, therefore, stands alone among the 70 California districts in its governance structure.

If the faculty at Glendale Community College were to be successful in their quest for separation, several steps may need to be taken. First, members of the Board must be positively influenced. The Faculty Senate needs to work through and with those two present members who campaigned on the "Separate Boards" issue; and it must seek out those and the other

three members and bring them into personal contact. Secondly, for the benefit of the whole of the community, arguments supporting separation need to be prioritized such that "cost" does not become tantamount to all the others. (This might be accomplished through individual talks of knowledgeable faculty with Board members. Also, by presenting the findings of this study and others to the Board at the time of the Arthur D. Little "Cost Feasibility" study -- in July or August of this year.) Thirdly, other community support, as well as continued support of the Associated Students and the College President must be enlisted. The Senate President might approach the College President in early Fall on the concept of a "College Association," mentioned earlier, to help influence the Board. As a further gesture of communication and appreciation, the President might even subscribe to the "Community and Junior College Journal", as well as the "Chronicle of Higher Education" for each member of the Board. If a new, more participatory model with a local structure of governance is to be realized in the near future, a further organized, participatory effort will be needed.

GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY CIRCLING THE RESPONSE WHICH MOST CLOSELY APPROXIMATES YOUR OWN: "STRONGLY AGREE," "AGREE," "NEUTRAL," "DISAGREE," "STRONGLY DISAGREE".

1. If Glendale College had a separate Board of Education, the academic programs would be improved.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. If Glendale College had a separate Board of Education, communication between the faculty and the administration would be improved.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. If Glendale College had a separate Board of Education, it would receive significantly greater support from the faculty than a board as now structured.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. If Glendale College had a separate Board of Education, it would be more responsive to the higher education needs of the community.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. If Glendale College had a separate Board of Education, it would provide greater administrative and decision making efficiency.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. If Glendale College had a separate Board of Education, its identity as an institution of higher learning would be enhanced.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. If Glendale College had a separate Board of Education, the morale of faculty and staff would be improved.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. If Glendale College had a separate Board of Education, that Board could better deal with the laws and educational codes as they relate directly to the Community College.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. If Glendale College had a separate Board of Education, Glendale taxpayers would receive greater value for their tax investment in Education.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

10. If Glendale College had a separate Board of Education, the faculty would be more motivated to innovate and initiate improvements in College programs.

    Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

11. The most important issue facing Glendale College at this time is whether or not it should have a separate Board of Education.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

12. Glendale College should have a separate Board of Education.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

PLEASE USE THE BACK OF THIS SHEET AND/OR ADDITIONAL PAPER IF YOU WISH TO RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTION:

13. Why should or why shouldn't Glendale College have a separate Board of Education?

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION: PLEASE CIRCLE THE CORRECT RESPONSE.

1. How long have you been a faculty member at Glendale College?

a. 0-5 years b. 6-10 years c. 11 or more years

2. What age group do you fall into?

a. 25 years and younger

b. 26-35 years

c. 36-45 years

d. 46 years and older

P.S. Please return the questionnaire to Bob Bochniarz via mailbox (Ad. 124) or, if you prefer, in person.(Ad. 113).

May 11, 1977

Dear Colleague:

Is it important that a separate Board of Education be established for Glendale Community College District? Accreditation teams have indicated the pro's and con's of this question over the past sixteen years. Various other studies have been undertaken over the years. With the completion of the attached questionnaire you will help considerably to crystalize the present faculty opinions on this subject.

Your candid responses will remain confidential and are urgently needed to draw a clear, concise summary as to where the faculty stand relative to the Separate Board issue. The results will be tabulated and included as a part of a complete Nova Ed.D. study, which will be available in early June. A summary of the faculty input will be submitted to the Board. Lastly, since the questionnaire is central to the study, your prompt reply will be appreciated. Please return your questionnaire to the mail box of Bob Bochniarz (AD 124) or, if you prefer, in person (AD 113).

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and input. And PLEASE TAKE THE FEW MINUTEES NEEDED TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AND RETURN IT BY NEXT TUESDAY, MAY 17.

GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

To what extent do you believe the following would occur if Glendale College elected to have a separate Board of Education?

1. The academic programs would be improved.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. Communication between the faculty and the administration would not be improved.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. The new Board would receive significantly greater support from the faculty in the form of attendance at Board meetings, reading Board reports, etc.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. The new Board would not be more responsive to the higher education needs of the community.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. The new Board would provide greater administrative and decision-making efficiency.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. The status of the faculty and the institution would not be enhanced.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. The morale of the faculty and staff would be improved.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. The new Board would not deal any better with the laws and educational codes as they relate directly to the Community College.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. Glendale taxpayers would receive greater value for their tax investment in education.

   Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

10. The faculty would not be more motivated to innovate and initiate improvements in college programs.

    Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

11. The most important issue facing Glendale College at this time is whether or not it should have a separate Board of Education.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

12. Even if the cost is not significant, Glendale College should not have a separate Board of Education.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

13. The academic programs would not be improved.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

14. Communication between the faculty and the Board would be improved.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

15. The new Board would not receive significantly greater support from the faculty in the form of attendance at Board meetings, reading Board reports, etc.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

16. The new Board would be more responsive to the higher education needs of the community.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

17. The new Board would not provide greater administrative and decision making efficiency.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

18. The status of the faculty and the institution would be enhanced.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

19. The morale of the faculty and the staff would not be improved.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

20. The new Board could better deal with the laws and educational codes as they relate directly to the Community College.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

21. Glendale taxpayers would not receive greater value for their tax investment in education.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

22. The faculty would be more motivated to innovate and initiate improvements in college programs.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

23. The most important issue facing Glendale College at this time is not whether or not it should have a separate Board of Education.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

24. Even if the cost is not significant, Glendale College should have a separate Board of Education.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Agree

PLEASE USE THE BACK OF THIS SHEET AND/OR ADDITIONAL PAPER IF YOU WISH TO RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

25. Why should or why shouldn't Glendale College have a separate Board of Education?

26. Why should or why shouldn't Glendale College have a separate Superintendent?

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION: PLEASE CIRCLE THE CORRECT RESPONSE

1. How long have you been a faculty member at Glendale College?

a. 0-5 years b. 6-10 years c. 11 or more years

2. What age group do you fall into?

a. 25 years and younger

b. 26-35 years

c. 36-45 years

d. 46 years and older

Please return the questionnaire to Bob Bochniarz via mailbox (AD 124) or, if you prefer, in person (AD 113). AS SOON AS CONVENIENTLY POSSIBLE - OR BY TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1977. THANK YOU.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS
1500 NORTH VERDUGO ROAD GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA 91208

January 16, 1975

To: The Faculty Senate Committee on Complete Separation of the Board of Education.

Tuesday morning, January 14, 1975, the ASB Legislature officially assumed the position of favoring the complete separation of the Board of Education. This action has, in effect, pledged the time and energy of the Legislature and general Student Body in this endeavor. Our assemblage will put forth a consolidated effort in the areas of petition circulation, precinct walking, telephoning and other various functions. We hope to make this proposal as successful as Proposition BB.

Fall Semester ASB President

Spring Semester ASB President

Sophomore Class President

Freshman Class President

Associated Women Students President

Associated Men Students President

Phi Alpha Theta President

Delta Chi Delta President

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges. "Glendale Community College Accreditation Report." Modesto, California, 1977.

2. Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges. "Report of the Accreditation Visit to Glendale Community College." San Jose, California, 1971.

3. American Educational Services. "Implications of a Separate Community College Board and Superintendent in Glendale California." Glendale Community College, Glendale, California, 1972.

4. Associated Students Separation Study Committee. "Report of the Separation Study Committee." Glendale Community College, Glendale, California, May 10, 1977.

5. A Statement by the Glendale College Staff. "A Case for a Separate Junior College District." Glendale, California, 1968.

6. Baldridge, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.

7. Blocker, Clyde E., Bender, Louis W. and Martorana, S.V. The Political Terrain of American Postsecondary Education. Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University Press, 1975.

8. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of Higher Education. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

9. Dziuba, Victoria and Meardy, William H., Editors. "Enhancing Trustee Effectiveness." New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 15. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, Inc., 1976.

10. Guilmette, Colin. "Why the Present Board Should Decide the Separate Board Issue Itself." (Paper presented at the Glendale Community College Board Meeting) Glendale, California, March 14, 1972.

11. Houtz, David C. "Separate Superintendents for the College and Unified." Long Beach Community College, Long Beach, California, February 9, 1976.

12. League of Women Voters of Glendale. "Study of Glendale College Administration, Financing and Function in the Community: With Emphasis on Evaluation of De-unification and Restricting Proposals." Glendale, California, 1968.

13. Lombardi, John. The Implications for Community College Governance under Collective Bargaining. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 086 298, March, 1974.

14. Meardy, William H. "Speaking Out!" A Speech on "The Trustee: An Endangered Species," presented May 20, 1976, to the Association of Community College Trustees by the Executive Director. Available Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees.

15. Richardson, Richard C. and Bender, Louis W. "College Governance." Practicum Guide. Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University Press, Second Edition, September, 1974.

16. Richardson, Richard C. "Restructuring the Human Dimensions of our Colleges." Junior College Journal. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, Vol. 41, No. 5, February, 1971.

17. _____. The Shape of Governance in the Future. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 114 146, April, 1975.

18. Statement by Mary Bergen, State Representative for California/ American Federation of Teachers. Telephone Interview. Sacramento, California, June 16, 1977.

19. Thayer, Martha. "Are Two Hats Better Than One?" Glendale Newspress. Glendale, California, 1975.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 3 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES